

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0175

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 20 is requested to be cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, and 24 are currently being amended. No new matter is added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-19 and 21-27 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

In Section 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 18, 20-21, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Failla (U.S. Patent No. 5,128,662) in view of Katsura (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,324). The Examiner indicated that Failla discloses a foldable display in which one section of the display is folded over the top of another portion of the display.

Failla in any proper combination with Katsura does not disclose, teach, or suggest "providing a first viewing area and providing a second viewing area substantially the same size as the first viewing area, the first viewing area foldable underneath the second viewing area." Nor does any proper combination of Failla and Katsura disclose, teach, or suggest "wherein a user may view images on the second viewing area when the display assembly is folded and on the combined first and second viewing areas when the display assembly is unfolded." The folded configuration of Failla is less advantageous in the context of a handheld computer or other

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0175

portable device because when the display and touch sensor combination is folded there is a wasted area exposed to the viewer where nothing can be displayed (i.e., the back of section 214). In Applicants' invention of both claims 18 and 24, one portion of the display is folded behind the other portion of the display, therefore, only the portion of the display being used is exposed to the viewer (see, e.g., configuration of FIG. 4 of Applicants' Specification). Therefore, for the handheld computer or portable device, space is used more efficiently, because in the folded state substantially the entire area of the display is used for displaying information. Therefore, because Failla in combination with Katsura does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claim limitations, claims 18 and their dependent claims are therefore allowable.

In Section 5 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9-10, 13 and 15 as being anticipated by Bodony et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,751) in view of Gamsaragan et al. (U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0140,690) and Failla.

As described above with regard to independent claims 18 and 24, Failla does not disclose, teach or suggest a portion of the display being folded behind another portion of the display in a folded condition. Further no combination of Failla, Bodony et al. and Gamsaragan et al. discloses, teaches, or suggest the folded behind limitation of claims 1, 7, and 13. Therefore, because not all of the claim limitations are shown in the prior art, claims 1, 7, and 13 and their respective dependent claims are therefore allowable.

In Section 7 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 6, 12, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bodony et al. in view of Gamsaragan et al. (U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0140,690) and Failla and further in view of Charlier (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0064751).

As described above with regard to independent claims 18 and 24, Failla does not disclose, teach or suggest a portion of the display being folded behind another portion of the display in a folded condition. Further no combination of Failla, Bodony et al., Charlier and Gamsaragan et al. discloses, teaches, or suggest the folded behind limitation of claims 1, 7, and 13. Therefore,

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0175

because not all of the claim limitations are shown in the prior art, claims 6, 12, and 17 are therefore allowable.

In Section 8 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 19, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Failla in view of Katsura and further in view of Comiskey (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0067427).

As described above with regard to independent claims 18 and 24, Failla does not disclose, teach or suggest a portion of the display being folded behind another portion of the display in a folded condition. Further no combination of Failla, Katsura, and Comiskey discloses, teaches, or suggests the folded behind limitation similar to claims 1, 7, and 13. Therefore, because not all of the claim limitations are shown in the prior art, claims 19 and 22 are therefore allowable.

In Section 9 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Failla in view of Katsura.

As described above with regard to independent claims 18 and 24, Failla does not disclose, teach or suggest a portion of the display being folded behind another portion of the display in a folded condition. Further no combination of Failla, and Katsura discloses, teaches, or suggest the folded behind limitation similar to claims 1, 7, and 13. Therefore, because not all of the claim limitations are shown in the prior art, claims 19 and 22 are therefore allowable. Applicants believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even

-10-

001.176057&amp;1

Arty. Dkt. No. 035451-0175

entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 16, 2005By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5730  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,603

-11-

091.1760578.1